

condition for allowance were discussed during the interview, and, by the above amendment, Applicant has attempted to implement all changes that were discussed. Each of the rejections and the amendments made to overcome those rejections are addressed below.

Claims 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 20 has been canceled by the above amendment and 22 has been amended to recite structure for detecting movement of the saw blade and to more clearly explain how locks selectively fix the saw blade. With regard to claim 25, the examiner agreed that the parallel identification bars did not form a part of the claimed sensor and that reciting both elements in this claim did not render the claim indefinite. The other issues raised by the examiner in connection with this claim have also been addressed by the above amendment.

In the last Office Action and during the Interview, the Examiner indicated that structure should be claimed to detect saw movement in order to avoid indefiniteness problems. All claims now include at least some structure to detect saw movement either in the horizontal plane, the vertical plane or both. Therefore, applicants believe that the present claims are no longer indefinite for this reason.

Claims 1 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Deley. Applicants respectfully disagree

with the Examiner's opinion concerning the previously pending claim, because Deley did not teach, for example, a "first lock means being operable to prevent said saw unit from moving in the horizontal direction in response to the movement of said saw unit in the vertical direction." To the contrary, Deley teaches a screw that is operated by the operator at a time when the saw unit is not moving for the purposes of safety. Deley does not provide any teaching or suggestion to prevent the saw unit from moving in one direction in response to movement in a perpendicular direction. Therefore, Applicants maintain that the previous claims were not anticipated by Deley. While the additional claim amendments necessitated by the Examiner's opinion that the claims were indefinite have the effect of further clarifying the claim scope, the amendments herein are not necessary or intended to overcome the rejection based upon Deley, as Applicants do not believe that Deley anticipated the previously filed claims.

Likewise, Applicants contend that the rejection of the previously filed claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon Itzov also was not proper, because Itzov also teaches a screw that is operated by the operator at a time when the saw unit is not moving for the purposes of safety. Consequently, Itzov also does not provide any teaching or suggestion to prevent the saw unit from moving in one direction in response to movement in a perpendicular direction. Therefore, Applicants

maintain that the previous claims also were not anticipated by Itzov. As a result, while the additional claim amendments necessitated by the Examiner's opinion that the claims were indefinite have the effect of further clarifying the claim scope, the amendments herein also are not necessary or intended to overcome the rejection based upon Itzov, as Applicants do not believe that Itzov anticipated the previously filed claims.

New claims 33 and 34 have been added by the above amendment, are also believed to be allowable.


Claims 13-17, 28-30 and 32 were listed as objectionable on the Office Action Summary Sheet that accompanied the July 19, 2000, Office Action, but were not discussed in the body of the Action. In the interview summary dated August 15, 2000, the examiner indicated that these claims were allowable over the prior art. These claims now all depend from allowable base claims and have been amended to correct potential Section 112, second paragraph rejections. It is therefore believed that all claims, including claims 13-17, 28-30 and 32 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-11 were withdrawn from consideration in an earlier Office Action. These claims depend from claim 1, which claim should now be allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that these claims be rejoined in the present application.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated July 19, 2000, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-19 and 21-34 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennison, Scheiner,
Schultz & Wakeman

By:


Scott T. Wakeman
Reg. No. 37,750
(703) 412-1155 Ext. 17